This paper examines the editorial principles underlying the eighth revised edition of Rudolf-Ernst Brünnow’s and August Fischer’s *Arabische Chrestomathie aus Prosaschriftstellern*, as carried out by Lutz Edzard and Amund Bjørnsnes. An essential feature of the added commentary to the text excerpts is the recourse to the methods and terminology in native Arabic grammatical theory. Throughout his career in research and teaching, Michael G. Carter has placed much weight on the appropriate application of native Arabic scholarship to an apt description and analysis of both Classical and Modern Standard Arabic, a principle also adopted in this new, eighth edition.

1 Introduction
One of the major achievements of Michael G. Carter has been to demonstrate the unbroken relevance of native Arabic grammatical theory to the proper description of morphological and syntactical features in both Classical and Modern Standard Arabic. Often, the unreflected use of Latinate terminology is not helpful when it comes to the analysis of the idiosyncrasies of Arabic grammar, or rather features that are not entirely in line with related features in Latin and Greek grammar. Concepts developed in native Arabic grammatical theory need not completely replace the explanatory devices of Latin and Greek grammar; however, additional recourse to the native Arabic concepts is definitely conducive to a better understanding of Arabic grammar. As will be shown in this paper, case and mood in Arabic provide major examples in this context. It is, of course, a truism that Arabic syntax, even on an elementary level, can hardly be described without terms such as ḍamīr aš-šaʾn (for a

---

1 This paper is dedicated to Michael G. Carter on the occasion of his 70th birthday in 2009. It is a fortunate coincidence that Michael Carter in fact checked the grammar, style, and contextual relevance of the notes to the English version of the revised edition of Rudolf-Ernst Brünnow’s and August Fischer’s *Chrestomathie*, for which we are most grateful.
pronoun of circumstance) or the ḥāl-clause (for circumstantial qualifier). On a more advanced level, terms such as maṣdar mīmī (a noun with an m-prefix, functioning as a maṣdar) or ʾin al-muḥaffafa (ʾin + independent case, followed by la-, instead of ʾinna + dependent case; cf. Wright, vol. 2: 81), to adduce only two examples, are indispensable for sound grammatical education. Moreover, concepts in native Arabic grammatical theory often exhibit striking parallels to concepts developed independently in modern linguistic theory, another point in favour of maintaining such terminology, as Michael G. Carter has frequently argued. The following discussion is not intended to bear directly on the perennial question of the extent to which Arabic grammatical theory may or may not be dependent on Greek grammatical theory. This is an issue which is independent of the question as to whether or not Greek (or Latin) terms, such as diptote/triptote, are felicitous as far as precise synchronic description of a morpho-phonological phenomenon in Arabic is concerned.

The new edition of Brünnow and Fischer’s *Chrestomathie* presented an opportunity to apply these principles, i.e., to refer to native Arabic concepts in addition to the reference to traditional grammatical tools, such as William Wright’s and Wolfdietrich Fischer’s grammars of Classical Arabic. This proved to be all the more important, insofar as the chrestomathy ended and culminated with the complete text of Ibn ʾĀġurrūm’s *Kitāb al-ʾĀġurrūmiyā*. Carter has dealt with this text in his detailed analysis of ʾaš-Šīrbīnī’s treatise, *Nūr as-sāğiya fī ḥall ʾalfāz al-ʾĀġurrūmiyā*, which technically constitutes a sort of hypertext flowing around Ibn ʾĀġurrūm’s treatise. The editors also decided to add the following text excerpts to the previous canon of texts, in line with a suggestion to that effect by August Fischer in his preface to the fourth edition of the chrestomathy from 1928:

(i) two excerpts of the preface to al-Ḥalīl’s *Kitāb al-ʾayn* (1: 47–49 and 58–60), which illustrate the phonetic principles and the root combinatorics, respectively, underlyng this first Arabic dictionary.

(ii) the lemma ‘quṭrub’ in Ibn Manẓūr’s *Lisān al-ʾarab* and az-Zabīdī’s *Ṭūğ al-ʾarūs*.

(iii) the passage ‘Fī ḥāl ʾāl-baṣr an-nās fī l-maʾnā llaḏī mīn ṣaǧī-hī summiya l-yaman yamanan wa-l-ʾīrāq wa l-ʾītāq wa l-ḥiğāz’ in al-

---

2 Cf. his seminal paper from 1973, in which the functional reduction of syntax to binary units, as perfomed by Sibawayhi, is compared with the principles in Immediate Constituent Analysis.

Masʿūdī’s Murūǧ ad-ḡahab wa-maʿādin al-ḡawhar (2: 190–91); (iv) the passages ‘Fī ḡumal min ‘albār al-buldān’ and ‘Bagdād’ in Yāqūt’s Muʿgām al-buldān (1: 52–54 and 677–678).

The ‘geographical’ excerpts at the end of the chrestomathy are etymological and lexical in nature and thus in harmony with the preceding passages. And again, the insight gained by Carter into various grammatical and lexical features of these texts proved to be extremely useful for the presentation of the new edition.4

2 Examples
In the following, we shall investigate relevant examples in context.5 First, the issue at hand is explained and the relevance of native grammatical theory in the respective context highlighted. Then the Arabic excerpt under discussion is cited, accompanied by a translation and followed verbatim by the commentary in the English version of the revised chrestomathy.

2.1 The first example involves the different grammatical uses of the case endings. As is well known, the Arabic term rafʿ covers the functions of the u-ending as marker of both ‘nominative’ (case) and ‘indicative’ (mood), just as the Arabic term naṣb covers the functions of both ‘accusative’ (case) and ‘subjunctive’ (mood). However, not all instances of a-endings on Arabic nouns can be appropriately captured by the term ‘accusative’, which has only a few uses other than marking the direct object. Therefore, it makes sense to use the terms ‘independent case’ for the ‘nominative’ and ‘dependent case’ for the ‘accusative’, respectively.

The following example concerns the apposition after a pronoun in the first or second person (p. 4, l. 2–5):

\[\text{نحن: apposition after a pronoun in the first or second person in the dependent case (naṣb in native Arab terminology).}\]

4 Cf. the cogent summaries of these topics in Carter 1990a and 1990b.

5 Page and line numbers in parentheses refer to the Arabic section of the chrestomathy.
cf. Fischer §§ 383b and 393, note 2; the term ‘accusative’ does not fit here, just as it does not in the cases of the absolute negation, أصحابْنحَ، vocative in the ʾidāfa, predicative participle (ḥāl), predicate of kāna and its sisters, and vocalised subject after ʾinna (cf., for example, Lipiński 2001: 259–67); rather, we are looking at a trace of an old Afroasian ‘predicative’ case, associated with an a-ending; for quasi-compounds like sāhib x, ʾahl x, or ḍū x (cf. Fischer, § 391 and Wright vol. 2, § 81).

2.2 At this point, it is instructive to consult the text of the ʾĀǧurrūmīya itself. One sees at once that the strictly functional definition of ʾiʿrāb captures the distribution of the ‘case’-marking vowels better than the mere transfer of the terms ‘nominative’, ‘genitive’, and ‘accusative’ to the description of the different grammatical operations in question. The ʾĀḏurrūmīya defines the term ʾiʿrāb as follows (p. 171, l. 11–12):

Inflection [properly ‘Arab(ci)sation’, i.e., the insertion of vowels] is the change of word-endings due to the variation of operators, which occur before them, either explicitly or implicitly. Its subdivisions are four: independence, dependence, obliqueness, and apocopation’ (cf. Carter 1981: 34, 38).

1. ʾāḏurrāb: cf., for instance, the articles ‘Declension’ (L. Edzard) and ‘ʾiʿrāb’ (K. Dévényi), in: EALL, vols. 1 and 2, respectively, s.v., for the functional character of the Arabic case and mood endings; note especially that the term rafʿ ‘independence’ (literally: ‘raising’) covers both the ‘nominative’ case and the ‘indicative’ mood (i.e., a grammatical u-ending), and the term nasb ‘dependence’ both the ‘accusative’ case (in its various functions) and the ‘subjunctive’ mood (i.e., in both cases a grammatical a-ending).


2.3 As far as the a-ending is concerned, the ʾĀḏurrūmīya lists the following possible functions of nasb, of which the direct object is just one possibility among many others (p. 179, l. 1–5):

The case-vowels change due to the variation of operators, which occur before them, either explicitly or implicitly. Its subdivisions are four: independence, dependence, obliqueness, and apocopation’ (cf. Carter 1981: 34, 38).

1. ʾāḏurrāb: cf., for instance, the articles ‘Declension’ (L. Edzard) and ‘ʾiʿrāb’ (K. Dévényi), in: EALL, vols. 1 and 2, respectively, s.v., for the functional character of the Arabic case and mood endings; note especially that the term rafʿ ‘independence’ (literally: ‘raising’) covers both the ‘nominative’ case and the ‘indicative’ mood (i.e., a grammatical u-ending), and the term nasb ‘dependence’ both the ‘accusative’ case (in its various functions) and the ‘subjunctive’ mood (i.e., in both cases a grammatical a-ending).

The dependent forms are fifteen in number: and they are the direct object, the verbal noun, the time-qualifier, the space-qualifier, the circumstantial qualifier, the specifying element, the excepted element, the noun negated by лā ‘no’, the vocative, the object of reason, the object of accompaniment, the predicate of kāna ‘to be’ and its related verbs, the subject-noun of ʾinna ‘verily’ and its related particles, {the two objects of ẓanantu ‘thought’ and its related verbs}, and the concordant of a dependent element, which comprises four things: the adjective, the coordinated element, the corroborative, and the substitute’ (cf. Carter 1981: 324, 326, 328).

1. The following enumeration only contains fourteen examples: therefore, the Beirut edition interpolated лāمفعو ُظننت ُواسم أن وأخواتها والتابع للمنصوب وأخواتها as fifteenth example; cf. Trumpp 1876: 86 and Carter 1981: 326f.; the older editions of the chrestomathy suggest that the fifteenth example may have been the mā al-ḥiğāzīya, as was taught by the commentator of the ʾĀğurrūmīya, al-Mākūdī (d. 1401).

2.4 A famous problem in the history of Arabic grammar relating to the opposition between independent case (rafʿ) and dependent case (naṣb) is the construction known as masʾalat az-zunbūr or al-masʿala al-zunbūrīya (cf. Blau 1963, Talmon 1997, and Carter 2004: 13). The issue here is whether or not the predicate of huwa in the following quotation can stand in the dependent case (i.e., can be preceded by the ‘accusative’ marker ʾīyā-) or not. According to Sībawayhi, this was not the case, whereas his adversary al-Kisāʾī claimed the contrary and bribed a Bedouin to testify to that effect. Consider the following quotation from Ibn Ḥallīkān’s Wafāyāt al-ʾaʾyān (p. 100, l. 8–10):

(4) وزعم الكسائي ان العرب تقول كنت اظن النحلة اشد لسعة من الضافي هو اياها فقال سيبويه ليس المثل كذا بل اذا هو هي

‘Al-Kisāʾī claimed that the Bedouin would say, “I have always thought that the hornet was more painful in stinging than the bee, and lo and behold, it is just that! (fa-ʾīḏā huwa ʾīyā-hā).” Sībawayhi, however, said: “The example is not [grammatically correct] like that; rather [the correct version is]: ‘and lo and behold, it is that! (fa-ʾīḏā huwa hiya).’”

99 ذهب الكوفيون الي انه يجوز ان يقال كنت اظن ان العقاب اشد لسعة من الزنبور اذا هو اياها وذهب البصريون الي...

2.5 So far we have looked at the syntactical implications of the terms rafʿ ‘independent case’ and nasb ‘dependent case’. But native Arabic is also important for a proper description of the pure morphology of case marking in Arabic. Michael Carter (personal communication) has always been dissatisfied with the unreflected use of the Greek terms ‘diptote’ (‘surfacing in two cases’) and ‘triptote’ (‘surfacing in three cases’), especially as all diptotes become triptotes when annexed or prefixed with the definite article. Therefore, Carter prefers the terms ‘semi-declinable’ and ‘fully declinable’ in this context. The following quotation from the ʿĀǧurrūmīya is instructive (p. 173, l. 2–8):

‘Obliqueness has three markers, (1) i, (2) āay, and (3) a. i is the marker of obliqueness in three places: (1) in the fully declinable singular noun, (2) in the fully declinable broken plural, and (3) in the sound feminine plural. And āay is the marker of obliqueness in three places: (1) in the five nouns [i.e. nouns tertiae infirmae, e.g., ’abī], (2) in the dual, and (3) in the [sound] plural. And a is the marker of obliqueness in the semi-declinable noun’ (cf. Carter 1981: 72, 74).

1.2 The use of Arabic terminology is also sensible in the case of other constructions, e.g., as regards the specific function of the preposition min in the ‘empty’ comparison in the construction known as masʿala al-kuhl. (‘Satzvergleich’). Consider the following excerpt from the sīra nabawiyya (p. 62, l. 8–10):

2.6 The use of Arabic terminology is also sensible in the case of other constructions, e.g., as regards the specific function of the preposition min in the ‘empty’ comparison in the construction known as masʿala al-kuhl. (‘Satzvergleich’). Consider the following excerpt from the sīra nabawiyya (p. 62, l. 8–10):
‘The Apostle smiled with joy when he marked their mien in prayer, and I never saw him with a nobler expression than he had that day’ (cf. Guillaume 1955: 681).

1. l. 10 منه refers to Muhammad; the construction is known as masʾalat al-kuḥl, cf. EL, s.v. ‘Taṣfīl’ (M. Carter).

2.7 A further construction, which can only be understood in its Arabic and Semitic context, is the conditional clause in which the apodosis does not express a direct logical consequence of the protasis, but rather expresses a comparison with a previous event (the logical apodosis has to be added mentally). In German grammatical nomenclature, the phenomenon is known as ‘Bedingungssatz mit Verschiebung’. Again, the sīra nabawīya features a relevant example (p. 62, l. 16 – p. 63, l. 4):

‘Had it not been for what ʿUmar said when he died, the Muslims would not have doubted that the Apostle had appointed ʾAbū Bakr his successor; but he [ʿUmar] said when he died: “If I appoint a successor one who is better than I did so; and if I leave them [to elect my successor] one better than I did so.” So the people knew that the Apostle had not appointed a successor and ʿUmar was not suspected of hostility towards ʾAbū Bakr’ (cf. Guillaume 1955: 681).

2.8 Michael Carter has cogently contributed to the now commonly accepted position that the historical value of Arabic phonemes cannot automatically be equated with their modern counterparts (cf. Carter 2004: 120–31). As stated above, the newly added sections in the chrestomathy contain two excerpts from al-Ḥallī’s Kitāb al-ʿayn, the first of which also has a bearing on this issue in that it concerns the phonetic principles underlying the Ḥallīan sequence. Let us here consider a passage from the second excerpt, which concerns the possible number of permutations,
depending on the number of root consonants. (The issue of co-occurrence restrictions is not raised explicitly in this context.) Here is the quotation (p. 186, l. 8 – p. 187, l. 6):

‘Know that the biliteral doubled word runs in two permutations, as ḥadda and ḍarra, ṣadda, and ḍašša. The triliteral has six permutations and is called “sixfold”, e.g., ḍaraba, ḍabara, barada, ḍadarba, ḍradaba, and rabda. The quadriliteral has twenty-four forms, because it has four letters, which are multiplied by the six forms of the triliteral, making twenty-four – of which those in use are recorded [in this work] and those neglected are omitted. An example is ʿabqara, from which one can form ʿaqrababa, ʿabraqaba, ḍabara, ḍabaraqaba, ḍarba, ḍrababa, ḍrababaqaba, ḍrababaqaba, ḍrababaqababa, ḍrababaqabababa, ḍrababaqababababa, ḍrababaqabababababa, ḍrababaqababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqabababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa, ḍrababaqababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababababa. 6

The quinquiliteral word produces 120 permutations, because the number of its five letters is multiplied by the twenty-four quadriliteral forms, making 120, of which only a minority are in use, the majority being rejected. An example is safarjal, ‘quince’, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, safarjal, and so on.7 (cf. Haywood 1960: 36).

1. l. 10 : مَسْدُوسَةٌ : “sixfold”; generally speaking, a root containing n radicals can surface in n! permutations (‘factorial n’ = n × [n – 1] × ... × 1), i.e., a root with two radicals in two permutations (2 × 1), a root with three radicals in six permutations (3 × 2 × 1), a root with four radicals in twenty-four permutations (4 × 3 × 2 × 1), and a root with five radicals

6 The form qaʿbara is missing in the Arabic list.

7 The form saɡarjal occurs twice in the Arabic list.
in one hundred and twenty permutations (5 × 4 × 3 × 2 × 1); only few sets of roots exhaust the possibilities.8

2.9 Other addenda in the chrestomathy are the lexical entries “qṭrub” in the Lisān al-ʿarab and the Tāg al-ʿarūs. Interestingly, qṭrub, deriving from the Greek λυκάνθρωπος “werewolf” (via Syriac qanṭroṣ) and a term for various psychological diseases, was also the nickname of a grammarian who used to creep around Sibawayhi’s door in the early morning. As far as we know, Quṭrub (ʿAbū ʿAlī Muhammad ibn al-Mustanīr)9 claimed that vowels were no longer case markers at his time, but merely sandhi vowels facilitating pronunciation and serving to distinguish context forms from pausal forms (cf. Carter 2004: 138).10 Here are two passages from the lemma “qṭrub” (p. 188, l. 1–2, and p. 189, l. 3–5):

‘Qṭrub: The qṭrub is a little reptile from the Ğāhiliya. One claims that it never keeps quiet, and it is said that it never rests, constantly walking around. [...] And qṭrub is also the nickname of Muḥammad ibn al-Mustanīr, the grammarian, who used to visit Sibawayhi early in the morning, and when Sibawayhi opened his door and found him there, Sibawayhi said to him: “You are just a night-qṭrub.” Therefore, Muḥammad ibn al-Mustanīr got the nickname Qṭrub.’

l. 1: Qṭrub : derived from Greek λυκάνθρωπος “werewolf”; the two lexical entries in Lisān al-ʿArab by Ibn Manzūr (d. 1312) and in Tāg al-ʿArūs by az-Zabīdī (d. 1791) should be studied in close conjunction with Ullmann 1976: دويبة : ‘a small, creeping creature’. 1. محمد بن المستنير : grammarian, d. 821. 1. كان يُبِكِّر : ‘he used to visit in the morning’.

2.10 The last addendum in the chrestomathy are two excerpts from Yaqūt’s geographical lexicon Muʿgam al-buldān. Let us finish our survey of the new edition with two passages in the section about the city Baghdad, in which different etymological approaches to the place name Baġdād are pondered (p. 198, l. 4–7, and p. 200, l. 4–5):

---

8 Based on a root count in Wehr, approximately every seventh possible root is attested among the triliteral roots.
10 This observation is definitely in line with what we assume to know about diglossia/polyglossia and the loss of ’iʿrāb in the history of Arabic.
Baghdad is the mother of the world and the mistress of countries. Ibn al-ʾAnbārī said: “The origin of [the word] Bağdâd is with the Persians, and the Arabs differ on its pronunciation, since the origin of Bağdâd does not belong to their speech and its etymology does not lie within their language.” Some Persians said that its [correct] interpretation is ‘garden of a man’, bag being ‘garden’ and dâd the name of a man. [...] It was also said that Bağdâd was called ‘city of peace’, because peace means God. Thus they meant “city of God.”’

1. Bağdâd: modern Iranians derive the name Baghdad from Old Persian bag ‘god’ and dâd ‘given’, i.e., ‘given by God’ (cf. H. Kennedy, ‘Baghdad’, Encyclopædia Iranica, vol. 3 (1989): 412–15); however, the name is already attested during the reign of Ḥammurapi in cuneiform documents, the ultimate etymology remaining unclear (cf. EI², s.v. ‘Baḏdâd’).

Conclusion
With this short overview we hope to have shown the principles underlying the new edition of Brünnow and Fischer’s Chrestomathie and to have given tribute to Michael Carter, both as regards his methodological principles in general and his particular input to the formulation of the newly added notes to the chrestomathy in particular. It is hoped that the rather difficult text excerpts thus become more accessible to beginning students of Classical Arabic and that students at the same time gain some understanding of the continuing relevance of native Arabic grammatical theory.
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